UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,277	10/17/2000	Syne Mitchell	MICR0194	4966

27792	7590	04/14/2004

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M. ANDERSON
600 108TH AVENUE N.E., SUITE 507
BELLEVUE, WA 98004

EXAMINER
LAZARO, DAVID R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 February 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
  closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16 and 18-25* is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16 and 18-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *18 February 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed on 2/13/04, paper

number 5.

2.   Claims 1, 12, 18, 22, 24 and 25 were amended.

3.   Claim 17 was canceled.

4.   Claims 1-16 and 18-25 are pending in this Office Action.

5.   Objections to Fig. 4 and Fig. 7 of the drawings are withdrawn. Formal drawings

received.

6.   The objection to Claim 25 as being in improper dependent form is withdrawn.

7.   The 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejections of Claims 11 and 25 are

withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9.   Claims 1, 11, 12, 18, 22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first

paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s)

contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the

application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The following subject

matter in the claims was not properly described in the application as filed: "without

requiring substantial modification of the content"; "without requiring substantial

modification of either the primary or the additional content"; or "without requiring

substantial modification of the additional content." The specification of the instant

application describes numerous modifications of the content. For example, on Page 19,

second paragraph, it is stated "modifications include changing one or more dimensions

of the content module, scaling the content module, changing text font size within the

content module, rotating the content module, providing a moving image of the content

within the content module, converting the content to audio or other manipulation of the

content module." However, there is no description in the specification of restricting or

limiting modifications done to the content. Furthermore there is no description of what

can be considered a "substantial modification". Since these descriptions are lacking,

the subject matter "without requiring substantial modification", in regards to any of the

content types, would not be conveyed to one skilled in the relevant art. Therefore these

Claims fail to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

11.   Claims 1-9, 11 and 18-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,300,947 by Kanevsky.

12.   With respect to Claim 1, Kanevsky teaches a method for selectively displaying an

additional content in a Web page based on an available display area (Col. 9 lines 39-

41), comprising the steps of: (a) automatically detecting dimensions of the available

display area (Col. 6 lines 4-28); (b) automatically determining whether the additional

content and a primary content can both be fully displayed in a single web page in the

available display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 9 lines

35-41 and Col. 10 lines 46-51) and without requiring substantial modification of either

the primary or the additional content (Col. 10 lines 46-51), said additional content not

being necessarily related to the primary content (Col. 9 lines 39-41); and if so, (c)

displaying the additional content and the primary content (Col. 9 lines 39-41 and Col. 10

lines 46-51); else (d) displaying only the primary content (Col. 8 lines 29-34).

13.   With respect to Claim 2, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and

further teaches wherein the available display area comprises an area defined by a

browser window (Col. 1 lines 36-47) produced by a browser program (Col. 4 lines 64-

65); and wherein the step of detecting the dimensions of the available display area

includes the steps of: (a) detecting properties of the browser program that produced the

browser window (Col. 5 lines 5-19 and line 63 to Col. 6 lines 3); (b) providing

instructions compatible with the detected properties of the browser program (Col. 5 lines

23-29); and (c) executing the instructions to automatically detect the dimensions of the

browser window (Col. 2 lines 12-19 and Col. 6 lines 20-27).

14.   With respect to Claim 3, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 2 and

further teaches wherein the step of automatically determining occurs when the browser

window is initially displayed by the browser program (Col. 7 lines 25-47 and Col. 16

lines 47-56).

15.   With respect to Claim 4, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 2 and further teaches wherein the step of automatically determining comprises the step of storing a pointer to a previously defined event handler used by the browser program (Col. 17 lines 50-59 and Col. 18 lines 1-14)).

16.   With respect to Claim 5, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 4 and further teaches wherein the previously defined event handler responds to at least one of initially displaying content in the browser window, and resizing the browser window (Col. 17 lines 50-59 and Col. 18 lines 1-14).

17.   With respect to Claim 6, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 5 and further teaches wherein the step of displaying only the primary content comprises the step of executing the previously defined event handler (Col. 17 lines 33-39).

18.   With respect to Claim 7, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the step of automatically determining comprises the step of automatically determining if at least one dimension of the available display area is sufficient to display the additional content (Col. 10 lines 39-41 and Col. 11 lines 49-51).

19.   With respect to Claim 8, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 5 and further teaches further comprising the step of responding to a change in the available display area by again automatically determining whether the additional content and the primary content can both be fully displayed in the available display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 17 lines 39-44 and lines 50-59 and Col. 11 line 49-51).

20.   With respect to Claim 9, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and

further teaches wherein the step of automatically determining comprises the step of

iteratively automatically determining whether a further additional content can be fully

displayed with the primary content and a previous additional content in the available

display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 10 lines 39-41,

Col. 11 lines 49-51 and lines 14-24).

21.   Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in Claim 1. Note also in

Kanevsky (Col. 5 lines 23-29).

22.   With respect to Claim 18, Kanevsky teaches a method for providing content to a

browser program for display in a browser window without requiring scrolling in more

than one direction to fully display the additional content, comprising the steps of: (a)

automatically detecting properties that identify the browser program (Col. 2 lines 12-19

and Col. 5 lines 5-19); (b) automatically determining instructions that are compatible

with the browser program (Col. 5 lines 23-29), to display at least a portion of the

additional content without scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 7 lines 25-28) and

without requiring substantial modification of the additional content (Col. 10 lines 46-51),

based on an available display area in the browser window (Col. 9 lines 39-41); and (c)

communicating the instructions to the browser program (Col. 2 lines 13-16), said

instructions causing the additional content to be fully displayed only if possible to do so

without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 7 lines 25-28).

23.   With respect to Claim 19, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 18 and

further teaches wherein the step of automatically detecting comprises the step of

parsing a request from the browser program for content to be displayed by the browser program, to determine information that identifies the browser program (Col. 6 lines 20-29 and lines 45-51).

24.   With respect to Claim 20, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 18 and further teaches wherein the step of automatically determining comprises the steps of: (a) determining a type of the browser program being used from the set of properties; and (Col. 5 lines 5-19) (b) selecting specific instructions written to be implemented by the type of the browser program being used (Col. 2 lines 12-19).

25.   With respect to Claim 21, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 18, wherein the step of communicating comprises the steps of: (a) obtaining the instructions that are compatible with the browser program (Col. 2 lines 12-19); (b) upon receiving a request for a content from the browser program, providing a response that includes at least a portion of the content requested (Col. 8 line 35-44) and the instructions (Col. 2 lines 12-19); and (c) conveying the response to the browser program (Col. 2 lines 12-19 and Col. 8 liens 35-44).

26.   With respect to Claim 22, Kanevsky teaches a system for displaying a Web page and selectively displaying an additional content, based on an available display area (Col. 9 lines 39-41), comprising: (a) a memory adapted to store data and machine instructions (Col. 5 lines 23-29); (b) a processor coupled to the memory, said processor controlling storage of data in the memory and executing the machine instructions to implement a plurality of functions (Col. 5 lines 23-29); (c) a persistent storage device., coupled to the processor and the memory, on which are stored machine instructions

(Col. 5 lines 23-29), which when executed by the processor, cause it to selectively fully display a primary content of a Web page and the additional content without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 7 lines 25-28 and Col. 9 lines 39-41) and without requiring substantial modification of either the primary or the additional content (Col. 10 lines 46-51), said additional content not being necessarily related to the primary content (Col. 9 lines 39-41): and (d) a display on which said primary content and said additional content are rendered in accord with the machine instructions, said display being controlled by the processor, said plurality of functions implemented by the processor executing the machine instructions (Col. 5 lines 5-19 and line 63 to Col. 6 line 3) including: (i) detecting dimensions of the available display area (Col. 6 lines 4-6 and 20-27); (ii) selectively displaying both the primary content and the additional content, if the primary content and the additional content are fully displayable without scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 9 lines 39-41 and Col. 10 lines 49-51); and if not, (iii) displaying only the primary content (Col. 8 lines 29-44).

27.   With respect to Claim 23, Kanevsky teaches all the limitations of Claim 22 and further teaches wherein the machine instructions that cause the processor to selectively display the additional content are downloaded to the memory over a computer network (Col. 2 lines 12-19).

28.   With respect to Claim 24, Kanevsky teaches a system for displaying a Web page and selectively displaying an additional content, based on an available display area (Col. 9 lines 39-41), comprising: (a) a remote computer operatively connected to a communication network, said remote computer including a processor, and a memory in

which machine instructions are stored that when executed by the processor while the

remote computer is coupled in communication with a client device, carry out a plurality

of functions (Col. 5 lines 20-56), including: (i) identifying a client browser program

running on the client device (Col. 2 lines 12-19 and Col. 5 lines 5-19); (ii) determining

machine instructions that are compatible with the client browser program (Col. 5 lines

23-29), for causing the client browser program to fully display at least a selected portion

of the additional content without scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 7 lines 25-28)

and without requiring substantial modification the additional content (Col. 10 lines 46-

51), based on the available display area on the client device (Col. 9 lines 39-41 and Col.

10 lines 49-51) ; and (iii) communicating the machine instructions to the client browser

program (Col. 2 lines 12-17); and (b) a client device operatively connected in

communication with the remote computer over said communication network, the client

device including a display, a processor, and a memory in which instructions are stored,

said instructions, when executed by the processor in the client device, carrying out a

plurality of functions, including (Col. 5 line 5 to Col. 6 line 3): (i) communicating said

client browser properties to said remote computer when requesting a primary, content of

a Web page from said remote computer (Col. 2 lines 12-17 and Col. 6 lines 20-28); (ii)

receiving said primary content and said machine instructions from said remote computer

(Col. 2 lines 12-19); (iii) detecting dimensions of an available display area on the client

device (Col. 6 lines 20-28); (iv) determining whether the additional content and the

primary content can both be fully displayed in the available display area without

requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 8 lines 26-44, Col. 9 lines 39-41 and

Col. 11 lines 14-24); and if so (v) displaying the additional content and the primary

content on the display of the client device (Col. 9 lines 39-41, Col. 10 lines 49-51 and

Col. 11 lines 14-24); else (vi) displaying only the primary content on the display of the

client device (Col. 8 lines 26-44).

29.   With respect to Claim 25, Kanevsky teaches a computer-readable medium

having a computer-executable component for selectively displaying an additional

content in a Web page based on an available display area (Col. 9 lines 39-41), wherein

said component is integral with a browser program in which the Web page is displayed

(Col. 2 lines 12-19), said computer-executable component causing a plurality of

functions to be carried out when executed by a computer, including: (a) automatically

determining whether an additional content and a primary content can both be fully

displayed in a single web page in the available display area without requiring scrolling in

more than one direction (Col. 9 lines 35-41 and Col. 10 lines 46-51) and without

requiring substantial modification of either the primary or the additional content (Col. 10

lines 46-51), said additional content not being necessarily related to the primary content

(Col. 9 lines 39-41); and if so, (c) displaying the additional content and the primary

content (Col. 9 lines 39-41 and Col. 10 lines 46-51); else (d) displaying only the primary

content (Col. 8 lines 29-34).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

30.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

31.   Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kanevsky in view of U.S. Patent 6,098,096 by Tsirigotis et al. (Tsirigotis). Kanevsky

teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 further teaches display of additional content (Col. 9

lines 39-41 and Col. 10 lines 49-51). Kanevsky does not explicitly disclose determining

if the additional content to be displayed was previously downloaded and retrieving the

content if needed. However, it is well known in the art that it can be determined if

content has been previously downloaded and retrieving the content if it was not as

shown by Tsirigotis (Col. 5 line 58 – Col. 6 line 8). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed

by Kanevsky and modify it as indicated by Tsirigotis such that wherein the step of

displaying the additional content and the primary content comprises the steps of: (a)

determining whether the additional content was previously downloaded from a remote

storage; and if not, (b) retrieving the additional content from the remote storage and

displaying both the primary content and the additional content; else (c) displaying both

the primary content and the additional content that was previously downloaded from the

remote storage. One would be motivated to have this as it saves time that would have

otherwise been used to retrieve the content (Col. 2 lines 24-36).

32.   Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kanevsky in view of U.S. Patent 6,593,943 by MacPhail.

33.   With respect to Claim 12, Kanevsky teaches a method for controlling display of a

Web page on a device (Col. 2 lines 12-19), comprising the steps of: (a) automatically

determining an available display area for displaying a content of the Web page on the

device (Col. 6 lines 4-28); (b) automatically determining a combination of different

portions of the content that can be fully displayed in a single web page in the available

display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction (Col. 8 lines 26-44

and Col. 9 lines 35-41 and Col. 11 lines 1-24) and without requiring substantial

modification of the content (Col. 11 lines 1-24) (c) displaying only the portion of the

content that can be fully displayed in the available display area without scrolling in more

than one direction (Col. 7 lines 25-28 and Col. 11 lines 14-24) and without requiring

substantial modification of the content (Col. 11 lines 1-24). Kanevsky does not explicitly

disclose the step of determining being one of automatically converting a portion of the

content into a moving image or automatically subdividing a portion of the content into

subportions that are displayed sequentially within the available display area. MacPhail

teaches that information from a web page can be divided such that portions are

displayed sequentially within the available display area (Col. 2 lines 3-8). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

take the method disclosed by Kanevsky and modify it as indicated by MacPhail such

that said step of automatically determining the combination of different portions of the

content comprises at least one of the steps of: (i) automatically converting a portion of

the content into a moving image within the available display area; and (ii) automatically

subdividing a portion of the content into subportions that are displayed sequentially

within the available display area. One would be motivated to have this as it is desirable

to efficiently deliver information to devices having displays of arbitrary size (Col.3 lines 14-17 of MacPhail).

1.   With respect to Claim 13, Kanevsky in view of MacPhail teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches the step of dividing the Web page into discrete content modules that are selectively displayable (Col. 11 lines 14-24).

2.   With respect to Claim 14, Kanevsky in view of MacPhail teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches wherein the step of determining the portion of the content that can be fully displayed in the available display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction comprises the step of prioritizing different portions of the content based on an order of importance, said different portions of the content corresponding to specific areas of the Web page that are selectively displayed as a function of the available display area (Col. 11 lines 14-24).

3.   With respect to Claim 15, Kanevsky in view of MacPhail teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches wherein the step of prioritizing comprises the step of ranking the different portions of the content according to their importance in conveying information on the Web page (Col. 11 lines 14-24 and 42-63).

4.   With respect to Claim 16, Kanevsky in view of MacPhail teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches wherein the step of automatically determining the portion of the content that can be fully displayed in the available display area without requiring scrolling in more than one direction, comprises the steps of: (a) detecting a respective share of the available display area required by each portion of the content (Col. 8 lines 49-53); and (b) automatically determining a combination of

different portions of the content that are displayable in the display area, based upon the

respective share of the display area required by each different portion of the content

(Col. 8 lines 44-53 and Col. 9 lines 35-41).

Response to Arguments

34.   Applicant's arguments filed 2/13/04 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

35.   Applicant argues that Kanevsky does not disclose determining a combination of

different portions of the content comprises at least the step of a portion being converted

into a moving image or the step of a portion being subdivided into subportions that are

sequentially displayed. However, U.S. Patent 6,593,943 by MacPhail discloses this.

36.   Applicant argues – *"Kanevsky's method fully displays a web page content with no*

substantial modification only when the available display space optimally matches the

Web page representation as originally designed. However if the available display space

is smaller than the web page representation as originally designed, Kanevsky's method

displays a substantially edited Web page content. Clearly, applicants' method is

different..."

> a.   Kanevsky's method does indeed display a web page content with no
>
> substantial modification when the display space optimally matches the original
>
> design. This correlates to when primary content and additional content cannot
>
> be displayed together, then only the primary content is displayed (Col. 8 lines 29-

43). While Kanevsky's method does include some modification of primary

content on smaller display sizes relative to original design specifications of the

web page, this is a situation where additional content cannot be displayed with

the primary content and only primary content is being displayed. In this situation,

some modifications are necessary as all primary content (or content of a web

page in general) cannot be expected to fit smaller displays. Kanevsky also

teaches additional content can be added to a web page displaying primary

content and available free space (Col. 7 lines 25-33 and Col. 10 lines 46-51).

This occurs without any modification of either content since the primary content

remains the same and additional content is merely added on. Furthermore, there

is no scrolling in any direction since the purpose of Kanevsky's method is to

adapt a page to fit the display size (Col. 7 lines 25-28). In other words,

Kanevsky's method recognizes when primary content and additional content can

both be displayed without scrolling in any direction and without "substantial"

modification of either content. Otherwise only the primary content is displayed.

Furthermore, the claimed subject matter is not directed towards the specific

instance or situation where *"the available display space is smaller than the web*

page representation as originally designed".

37.   Applicant argues – *"Kanevsky's method teaches the use of multiple web pages to*

display the primary and any secondary content...applicant's method does not require

the user to perform the additional steps of opening multiple web pages in order to view

primary and additional content."

    b.   While Kanevsky's method in one embodiment does use multiple web

pages to display content, this is directed to the situation where primary content

and additional content cannot be displayed together and the primary content is

broken up into a series of pages. Kanevsky also teaches that primary content

and additional content can be displayed together without the additional steps of

opening multiple web pages (Col. 10 lines 46-51).

38.   Applicant argues – *"Kanevsky's method displays additional content only if it is*

related to the primary content. In contrast, applicants' method displays content without

regard to its source or its relationship to the primary content."

    c.   In general, Kanevsky teaches objects (such as icons, text, graphic

images) and links can be added to the web page when there is space to display

both the primary and additional content (Col. 9 lines 39-41). Kanevsky's method

does not explicitly limit the additional content being related to the primary

content.

39.   Applicant argues – *"The user may have to scroll in two directions in order to view*

the content in Kanevsky. In other situations, scroll bars are not used, since Kanevsky

substantially modifies the content... in order to display content. In contrast, applicant's

method only displays the additional content and primary content if the user can view the

additional and primary content without having to scroll in more than one direction and

without substantially modifying the additional and primary content."

d.   The scrolling situation described <u>may</u> be used or a zoom function could be

provided instead (Col. 16 lines 24-29). Furthermore, this situation is one where

only primary content is being displayed as additional content and primary content

could not be displayed together. As shown earlier, Kanevsky's method does not

modify either content in situations where additional content can be displayed with

primary content (Col. 10 lines 46-51) and the page is fully displayed without

scrolling in any direction (Col. 8 lines 25-28) which qualifies as "without having to

scroll in more than one direction". Therefore Kanevsky teaches displaying the

additional content and primary content if the user can view the additional content

and primary content without having to scroll in more than one direction and

without substantially modifying the additional and primary content."

40.   Applicant argues – *"Kanevsky displays a substantially edited content on a Web*

page if the available display space is smaller than the Web page representation as

originally designed...In Contrast, applicant's method displays a combination of different

portions of content on a web page...without requiring the content to be substantially

modified."

e.   Although modification of Web page content occurs in Kanevsky in certain

disclosed embodiments, it cannot be determined if these modifications, where

pertinent to the situation of the claimed subject matter, should be considered

"substantial". The most basic of Kanevsky's modifications in regards to this argument would be breaking the Web page into different portions that are prioritized (Col. 11 lines 1-24). Applicant argues Kanevsky is teaching substantially edited content. However, the applicant's specification gives no evidence or description of what is considered "substantially modified" content. More specifically the specification does not disclose any modifications, like those described by Kanevsky, as being "substantial" modifications. Furthermore, with specific reference to Claim 12 of the instant application, the Applicant claims determining a combination of different portions of the content comprises at least the step of a portion being converted into a moving image or the step of a portion being subdivided into subportions that are sequentially displayed. Either of these steps could be interpreted as being "substantial" modifications. Since the definition and limitations of "substantial" is not shown or disclosed, this argument is invalid.

41.   Applicant argues – "*Kanevsky does not teach or suggest displaying a combination of content on a single Web page. Instead, Kanevsky displays content on a single Web page with links to other Web pages…to view the content represents by the links, if prioritized object of a known size cannot fit on the screen…applicant's method does not require the user to open multiple Web pages in order to view the entire content.*

f.   The claim subject matter (Claim 12 of instant application) concerning this

argument includes the following limitation:

i.   '(c) displaying only the portion of the content that can be fully

displayed in the available display area without scrolling in more than one

direction and without requiring substantial modification of the content'

The applicant's argument is assuming then that "the entire content" would indeed

fit the available display space. However, the argument is using a different

situation where a "prioritized object of a known size cannot fit on the screen".

Therefore this argument is moot. Furthermore, in regards to the links to other

pages, this is merely an additionally step taught by Kanevsky that will allow a

user to view the portion of content that could not be "fully displayed in the

available display area".

42.   Applicant argues – "*Kanevsky does not teach that machine instructions are

communicated to the client browser program for displaying a primary and additional

content...There is no teaching or suggestion of communicating machine instructions

from a server to a client computer.*"

g.   Kanevsky specifically teaches that the invention can be carried out in part

through the use of a Java applet (Col. 2 lines 12-16). One of the inherent

benefits of a Java applet is portability of code from a server to a client. Java

applets can function through a reference in a requested Web page such that the

applet and its associated machine instructions are sent to and run on the client

system. Therefore Kanevsky teaches communication of machine instructions

from a server to a client computer.

Conclusion

43.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

44.   U.S. Patent 6,462,752 by Ma et al. "Automatic scrolling function for editors and

browsers" October 8, 2002. Also teaches automatic paging function.

45.   U.S. Patent 6,336,124 by Alam et al. "Conversion data representing a document

to other formats for manipulation and display" January 1, 2002. Teaches dividing and

subdividing of information contained in a web document.

46.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this

communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to

David Lazaro whose telephone number is 703-305-4868. The examiner can normally

be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 703-308-6662. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Lazaro
April 8, 2004

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER